

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,610 07/24/2003		4/2003	Hiroaki Kitayama	1422-0597P	7947
2292	7590	09/21/2005		EXAMINER	
		DLASCH & BIR	UMEZ ERONIN	UMEZ ERONINI, LYNETTE T	
PO BOX 74 FALLS CH	7 URCH, VA	22040-0747	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
11220011				1765	
				D. TT. 14.11 FD. 0001 D00	_

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\mathcal{U}				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/625,610	KITAYAMA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Lynette T. Umez-Eronini	1765				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPOWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IT after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to divide apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the course the application to become ABANDON	N). imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23.	August 2005.					
. 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ Th						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
ciosed in accordance with the practice under	⊏х раπе Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 U.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-5 and 10-15 is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1.2 and 8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 6.7 and 9 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 3-5 and 10-15 are subject to restrict. 	e withdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ction is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applica Ority documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/24/03, 4/19/04, 9/20/04, and 7/2	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 22/05. 6) Other:					

11

Application/Control Number: 10/625,610 Page 2

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-2 and 6-9, in the reply filed on 8/23/2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6, 7, and 9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 6, 7, and 9 fail to limit the subject matter of a previous claim because they depend from a non-elected claim. Accordingly the claims have not been treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
 - (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1765

4. Claims 1, 2, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wake et al. (US 6,434,811 B1).

Wake teaches a polishing slurry that comprises as a basic composition, a polishing material, an oxidizing agent, an organic acid such as citric acid and water (column 5, lines 52-54). Wake further teaches adding a carboxylic acid that is different from citric acid can be added to the polishing slurry. Carboxylic acids other than citric acid include succinic and glutaric acids and their salts (column 10, lines 31-42). Table 1 shows polishing slurries that comprise alumina and glutaric acid having 0.16 wt %. The aforementioned reads on,

A polishing composition comprising 0.03 to 0.5% by weight of an organic acid or a salt thereof, an abrasive and water. Since Wake's polishing composition comprises an alumina abrasive; an organic acid, which has a content that falls within applicants' claimed weight percentage; and water, and which further comprises the same chemicals as specifically claimed by applicants, then using Wake's composition in the same manner as claimed by applicants' would inherently result wherein the abrasive has a surface potential of from -140 to 200 mV, in claim 1.

The said aforementioned also reads on, wherein the organic acid is a polycarboxylic acid having 2 to 10 carbon atoms, having either OH group or groups or SH group or groups, in claim 2; and wherein the abrasive is alumina, in claim 9.

Application/Control Number: 10/625,610 Page 4

Art Unit: 1765

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynette T. Umez-Eronini whose telephone number is 571-272-1470. The examiner is normally unavailable on the First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit 1765

Itue

September 12, 2005

NADINE G. NORTON SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER